



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,324	02/26/2002	Anatoliy Panasyuk	2006579-0420	4049
24280	7590	06/13/2006	EXAMINER	
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE BOSTON, MA 02110			HENNING, MATTHEW T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2131	

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/083,324	Applicant(s) PANASYUK ET AL.	
	Examiner Matthew T. Henning	Art Unit 2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-68 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-68 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 February 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1 This action is in response to the communication filed on 3/27/2006.

2 **DETAILED ACTION**

3 ***Response to Arguments***

4 Applicant's arguments filed 3/27/2006 have been fully considered but they are not
5 persuasive.

6 Regarding applicants' argument that "further detailed illustration of the[] features in the
7 Figures is not essential for a proper understanding of the invention", the examiner does not find
8 the argument persuasive. 37 CFR 1.83(a) states that the drawings must show every feature of the
9 invention as specified in the claims. Therefore, what one of ordinary skill in the art would
10 understand from the drawings is not relevant to the objection, but instead the features which are
11 claimed must be shown in the drawings. As such, as admitted by the applicants, on pages 12-13
12 of the communication dated 3/27/2006, the claimed features pointed to by the examiner are not
13 shown, and therefore the drawings do not comply with 37 CFR 1.83(a). Therefore, the examiner
14 has maintained the objection to the drawings below.

15 Regarding applicants' argument that Brezak does not disclose "a ticket...comprising a
16 first ticket and a second ticket", the examiner does not find the argument persuasive. Brezak
17 clearly disclosed a first ticket (a TGT or ticket granting ticket) and a second ticket (a service
18 ticket). There is no requirement that the "a ticket" be anything more than two single tickets, as
19 argued by the applicants. And in fact, paragraph 0055 of the specification states that "the ticket
20 authority 225 may issue more than one ticket rather than issuing one ticket having many parts."
21 The limitation in the claim does not require one ticket having many parts, but instead clearly

claims two (multiple) tickets. As such, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive and has therefore maintained the rejection below.

Regarding applicants' argument that Brezak does not disclose a first ticket authority generating a first ticket and a second ticket authority generating a second ticket, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive. Brezak disclosed an authentication service (206) inside of a trusted third party (204), and further that the authentication service generated the tickets, as seen in Brezak Paragraphs 0040, 0042, and 0043. Because the authentication resided within the trusted third party, the trusted third party inherently generated the tickets as well, and therefore Brezak meets the limitations of the claim language. This is analogous to a freezer which contains an icemaker. When the icemaker makes ice, it is also correct to say that the freezer made the ice because the ice maker is part of the freezer. Further, there is no requirement in the claim language that the ticket authorities be spatially or physically separate, nor is there a requirement that neither authority generates both tickets. As such, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive.

Claims 1-68 have been examined.

All objections and rejections not set forth below have been withdrawn.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the disabled ticket and the enabled ticket, as well as the step of enabling the disabled ticket must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1 Claims 1-6, 10-19, 21, 23-28, 32-42, 44-52, 56-64, and 66-68 are rejected under 35
2 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brezak et al. (US Patent Application Publication
3 2003/0018913) hereinafter referred to as Brezak.

4 Regarding claim 1, Brezak disclosed a method of authenticating a client to a content
5 server (See Brezak Abstract and Fig. 2) comprising the steps of: generating, by a ticket authority
6 (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 206), a ticket associated with said client (See Brezak Paragraphs
7 0042-0043), said ticket comprising a first ticket and a second ticket wherein said second ticket is
8 disabled from use (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043 and 0045); transmitting, by said ticket
9 authority, said first ticket to said client (See Brezak Paragraph 0042-0043); validating, by said
10 ticket authority, said first ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043 and 0045-0048); using, by said
11 client, said first ticket to establish a communication session with a content server proxy after said
12 first ticket is validated (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043-0045); enabling, by said ticket authority,
13 said second ticket for use upon said validation of said first ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-
14 0048); and using, by said content server proxy, said enabled second ticket to establish a
15 communication session with said content server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-0048).

16 Regarding claim 23, Brezak disclosed a system for authenticating a user (See Brezak
17 Abstract and Fig. 2) comprising: a client (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 202); a ticket authority (See
18 Brezak Fig. 2 Element 206); a content server (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 214); and a content
19 server proxy (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 210) in communication with said client, said ticket
20 authority, and said content server (See Brezak Fig. 2), wherein said ticket authority generates a
21 ticket associated with said client (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043), said ticket comprising a
22 first ticket and a second ticket, wherein said first ticket is transmitted to said client and used to

1 establish a first communication session with said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraphs
2 0042-0043 and 0045), and wherein said second ticket is transmitted to said content server proxy
3 and used to establish a second communication session with said content server (See Brezak
4 Paragraphs 0043 and 0045).

5 Regarding claim 45, Brezak disclosed a system for authenticating a user (See Brezak
6 Abstract and Fig. 2) comprising: a client (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 202); a ticket authority
7 generating a ticket associated with said client (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 206 and Paragraphs
8 0042-0043), said ticket comprising a first ticket and a second ticket wherein said second ticket is
9 disabled from use (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043 and 0045); a content server (See Brezak
10 Fig. 2 Element 214); a content server proxy in communication with said client, said ticket
11 authority, and said content server (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 210) and receiving said first ticket
12 (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0044); and a web server in communication with said client and
13 said ticket authority (See Brezak Fig. 1 Element 178 and Paragraphs 0031-0032), wherein said
14 content server proxy establishes a first communication session between said client and said
15 content server proxy after said ticket authority validates said first ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs
16 0043-0045), wherein said ticket authority enables said second ticket after said validation of said
17 first ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-0048), and wherein said content server proxy uses said
18 enabled second ticket to establish a second communication session with a protocol different from
19 said first communication session protocol (See Brezak Paragraph 0045).

20 Regarding claim 67, Brezak disclosed a system for authenticating a user (See Brezak
21 Abstract and Fig.2) comprising: a client (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 202); a first ticket authority
22 (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 204 and Paragraph 0040); a second ticket authority (See Brezak Fig.

1 2 Element 206 and Paragraph 0040); a content server (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 214); and a
2 content server proxy in communication with said client, said first ticket authority, and said
3 content server (See Brezak Fig. 2 Element 210), wherein said first ticket authority generates a
4 first ticket associated with said client, wherein said second ticket authority generates a second
5 ticket associated with said content server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0040, 0042-0043 and 0045),
6 wherein said first ticket is transmitted to said client and used to establish a first communication
7 session with said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043 and 0045), and wherein said
8 second ticket is transmitted to said content server proxy and used to establish a second
9 communication session with said content server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043 and 0045).

10 Regarding claim 68, Brezak disclosed a system for authenticating a user (See Brezak
11 Abstract and Fig. 2) comprising; means for generating, by a ticket authority, a ticket associated
12 with a client, said ticket comprising a first ticket and a second ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs
13 0042-0043 and 0045); means for transmitting, by said ticket authority, said first ticket to said
14 client (See Brezak Paragraphs 0042-0043); means for using, by said client, said first ticket to
15 establish a first communication session with a content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043
16 and 0045); means for transmitting, by said ticket authority, said second ticket to said content
17 server proxy (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043 and 0045-0048); and means for using, by said content
18 server proxy, said second ticket to establish a second communication session with a content
19 server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-0048).

20 Regarding claims 2, 24, and 46, Brezak disclosed that prior to generating said
21 ticket associated with said client, said client is authenticated with a web server (See Brezak
22 Paragraphs 0042-0043).

Art Unit: 2131

1 Regarding claims 3, 25, and 47-48, Brezak disclosed that said ticket authority transmits
2 said first ticket to a web server and said web server transmits said first ticket to said client (See
3 Brezak Paragraphs 0031-0032).

4 Regarding claims 4, 26, and 49, Brezak disclosed that said client transmits said first ticket
5 to said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraph 0043 and 0044).

6 Regarding claims 5, 27, and 50-51, Brezak disclosed that said content server proxy
7 transmits said first ticket to said ticket authority and said ticket authority transmits said second
8 ticket to said content server proxy upon validation of said first ticket (See Brezak Paragraphs
9 0045-0048).

10 Regarding claims 6, 10, 28,32, 52 and 56, Brezak disclosed that said content server proxy
11 transmits said second ticket to said content server upon said enabling of said second ticket (See
12 Brezak Paragraph 0036 and 0045).

13 Regarding claims 11, 33-34, and 57-58, Brezak disclosed that said ticket authority
14 transmits said first ticket and said disabled second ticket to a web server and said web server
15 transmits said first ticket and said disabled second ticket to said client (See Brezak Paragraphs
16 0031-0032 and 0042-0043).

17 Regarding claims 12, 35, and 59, Brezak disclosed that said client transmits said first
18 ticket and said disabled second ticket to said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043
19 and 0044).

20 Regarding claim 13, Brezak disclosed transmitting said disabled second ticket to at least
21 one of said content server proxy and a web server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0043).

Art Unit: 2131

1 Regarding claims 36, and 60, Brezak disclosed that said content server proxy transmits
2 said first ticket and said disabled second ticket to said ticket authority and said ticket authority
3 enables said disabled second ticket (See Brezak Paragraph 0045).

4 Regarding claims 14, 37, and 61, Brezak disclosed transmitting said enabled second
5 ticket to said content server proxy (See Brezak Paragraph 0048).

6 Regarding claims 15, 38, and 62, Brezak disclosed that a communication session protocol
7 is established between said client and said content server (See Brezak Paragraph 0036).

8 Regarding claims 16-17, 39-40, and 63-64, Brezak disclosed that a first communication
9 session protocol is established between said client and said content server proxy and a second
10 communication session protocol is established between said content server proxy and said
11 content server, wherein said first communication session protocol is different from said second
12 communication session protocol (See Brezak Paragraphs 0036 and 0043), said client
13 communicating with said content server via said first communication session and said second
14 communication session (See Brezak Paragraphs 0041, 0043, 0044, and Fig. 2).

15 Regarding claims 18-19, and 41-42, Brezak disclosed that a first communication session
16 protocol is established between said client and said content server proxy and a second
17 communication session protocol is established between said client and a web server, wherein
18 said first communication session protocol is different from said second communication session
19 protocol (See Brezak Paragraphs 0031-0032 and 0043).

20 Regarding claims 21, 44, and 66, Brezak disclosed that said content server proxy is a
21 secure socket layer relay (See Brezak Paragraphs 0048-0049, and 0053).

22

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 20, 22, 43, and 65 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brezak. Brezak a client system including many features such as accessing web sites (See Brezak Paragraphs 0005 and 0016-0033), and transmitting a second ticket to a proxy server for the use of a specifically identified server (See Brezak Paragraphs 0048-0049), but failed to disclose that the client comprised a web browser or that the server was identified by its address. It was well known in the art at the time of invention that computers had web browsers for accessing web sites. It was further well know in the art at the time of invention that servers were identified by their address. Therefore, it would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of invention to provide the client with a web browser and to identify the target server by its address. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to apply what was well known and common in the art at the time.

Claims 7-9, 29-31, and 53-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brezak as applied to claims 1, 23, and 45 above, and further in view of Litai et al. (US Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0233554) hereinafter referred to as Litai.

1 Brezak disclosed accessing a target server through a proxy server using a service ticket
2 (See Brezak Paragraphs 0045-0048) but failed to disclose the specific method used for the target
3 server to verify the service ticket.

4 Litai teaches that in a ticketing system, in order for a server to verify a service ticket, the
5 server sends the ticket to the ticket server (See Litai Paragraph 0046).

6 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
7 invention to employ the teachings of Litai in the ticketing system by having the target server
8 send the service ticket to the trusted third party in order to have the ticket verified. This would
9 have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to
10 protect the server from unauthorized access.

11
12 ***Conclusion***

13 Claims 1-68 have been rejected.

14 **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time
15 policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

16 A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE
17 MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO
18 MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after
19 the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period
20 will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37
21 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2131

1 however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing
2 date of this final action.


3 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
4 examiner should be directed to Matthew T. Henning whose telephone number is (571) 272-3790.
5 The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4.

6 If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
7 supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the
8 organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

9 Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent
10 Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications
11 may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished
12 applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR
13 system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR
14 system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would
15 like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated
16 information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

17
18
19
20
21
22 

23 Matthew Henning
24 Assistant Examiner
25 Art Unit 2131
26 6/5/2006

27

AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100